

Sandralyn Bailey

FILED/ACCEPTED

06-789

From: chuck [ckatalenas@aatt.net]
Sent: Monday, January 01, 2007 6:34 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: cable rates

FEB - 9 2007
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I am also in favor of you looking at what is going on with the high prices of cable rates. every year my rates have gone up and Time warner has dropped channels only to add more selling channels.

A few years ago it was cspan 2& 3 that were dropped, this year it was Nat Geo and Animal Planet from our basic and expanded cable service. We were told that this was so time warner could set up a family plan of friendly channels that we could get at a speical rate.

Forget trying to complain to our city. we have been told that the rates for basic cable are so high since time warner has to pay the local networks money to rebroadcast the shows. Cost was told as \$.50 per channel per household per month, However the local TV networks say they are not paid a dime. Just the local govt and politicians get the money to help thier reelections.

I was unable to get a striaght anwer why the rates for digital cable(Over 300 channels) is so close to basic cable rates (63 channels) using the logic of a fee per channel.

Our City (Round Rock)and Austih will not allow any other cable company to come in and bid for services due to the high cost of equipment or infurstructure.

I aready know that there is no antitrust enforcement, gas prices, airlines, Hwy construction. etc. They only go after doctors who want to get 110% of the govt set medicare rate fee, you will note that medicare rates are set to go down again this year even after the medical expenses still go up, rent, fed lic fees, salaries, taxes etc.

A former hwy antitrust investigator for TXDOT.

Sincerely
Chuck Katalenas
512-310-2443
MS MBA

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

SandraLyn Bailey

06-189

From: Chris Newman [newman000304@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 28, 2007 5:43 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

FEB - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Chris Newman (newman000304@yahoo.com) writes:

The consumer should have freedom of choice when selecting television, cable, and internet services. The local government argument that they benefit the consumer is ludicrous! They are interested in the revenue opportunities which they can extract versus forcing open market competition. The markets should be open and allow the consumer freedom of choice.

Secondly, the fees the consumer pays for access fees, miscellaneous charges, and public access channels is horrendous. There are too many channels which are of interest to the majority of consumers. The greater good should outweigh the good of a small few. I suggest the unbundling of the public access garbage channels and allow those who wish to have those channels to subscribe, however I as the consumer should not subsidize those waste of money. In flipping channels I've seen local talent contest to other junk that is not beneficial to the consumer.

Please continue your fight to make the cable, internet, and phone services open to full market competition. Get the local governments out of it as part of a revenue raiser. The television, radio are public domain and should not be made a pawn in local government's desire to control it. They have no place there except in the event of an emergency!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 192.104.54.5
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Sandralyn Bailey

06-189

From: E. Donald Kaye [bezvodka@post.harvard.edu]
Sent: Sunday, January 28, 2007 2:14 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

FEB - 9 2007

E. Donald Kaye (bezvodka@post.harvard.edu) writes:

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I rarely agree with the Republican led FCC but this time I do. "Local oversight" of the cable tv monopoly is a laugh. In Santa Fe NM if one complains to the city about Comcast practices, the reply is not from the city, but from Comcast! (and it is always the same: "too bad." There is no oversight and competition will be the only solution, if there is any solution.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 192.104.54.5
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Sandralyn Bailey

06789

From: STEWART YOUNG [stewartyoung11@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 03, 2007 1:55 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

FEB - 9 2007

STEWART YOUNG (stewartyoung11@hotmail.com) writes:

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I HOPE YOU CONTINUE TO LOOK INTO OPENING UP SOME MORE LICENCES FOR MORE CABLE COMPANIES. BELOW IS A COMPLAINT I MADE TO THE FCC ABOUT THE GIANT IN THE BUSINESS COMCAST.

COMCAST IS INVOLVED IN A VERY LUCRATIVE AND ELABORATE BOGUS BILLING SYSTEM WHICH IS COSTING UNSUSPECTING CONSUMERS MILLIONS OF DOLLARS ON THERE CABLE BILL. I GOT OVER BILLED IN EXCESS OF \$221.00 BY COMCAST. THIS BILL THEY SAID WAS CAUSED BY ME ORDERING SEX MOVIES FROM THEIR PAY PER VIEW SECTION. I VEHEMENTLY HAS DENIED THIS CHARGE BY COMCAST BUT THEY REFUSE TO CREDIT MY BILL INSTEAD INSISTING THAT IT WAS I WHO MADE THESE ORDERING OF THE SEX MOVIES FROM MY HOUSE USING MY REMOTE CONTOL. THEY ADD A SUPERVISOR CALLED ME TO TELL ME I WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS BILL AND THERE WAS NO MISTAKE ON THE PART OF COMCAST. I MADE OVER 7 PHONES CALS BACK AND FORTH TO COMCAST UNTIL I FINALLY GOT A HONEST WORKER AT COMCAST WHO TOLD ME IT WAS A DEFECTIVE CABLE BOX WHICH IS MAKING THESE ORDERING OF THE PAY PER VIEW SEX MOVIES AND THEN BILLING THE CUSTOMERS. THIS WORKER ALSO TOLD ME HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF COMPLAINTS HAVE BEEN COMING IN TO THE COMCAST CALL CENTER ABOUT THIS KIND OF BILLING PROBLEM AND THEY KNOW ABOUT IT BUT IT STILL GOES ON OVER THE YEARS. THIS IS A RIP OFF THATS BEEN SETUP BY COMCAST WHO IS MAKING MILLIONS OF DOLLARS ON THIS BOGUS BILLING PRACTICES AND TRY TO CONVINCE CONSUMERS THAT THEY MADE THOSE PURCHASES. I GOT A CREDIT ON MY ACCOUNT BECAUSE I CONFRONTED THEM WITH WHAT I FOUND OUT ABOUT THE CABLE BOXES.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 192.104.54.5
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Sandralyn Bailey

06789

From: Modude62D@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, January 28, 2007 3:13 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Cable Compation

FILED/ACCEPTED

FEB - 9 / 007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

In Springfield Missouri our City Council ignored the wishes of the majority of the people, as demonstrated in public hearings and polls, and against the advice of different consumer groups passed a cable franchise ordnance that in affect precludes any competition to Mediacom cable Company . Now it is up to the State of Missouri or Federal Government to in act rules or laws that will give us The people the right and ability to select the cheapest and best cable providers for us .

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

2/8/2007

SandraLyn Bailey

06-189

From: Bernie Barton [bernie@starband.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 04, 2007 5:50 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: broadcaster-cable rate extortion

FILED/ACCEPTED

FEB - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
 Office of the Secretary

First, may I congratulate your office on recently approving rules changes which open communities to further video competition... The purpose of this letter is to express concern about television broadcasters and their rights of negotiation with cable/satellite system operators... This is not an equitable situation... Broadcasters, heavily subsidized in terms of spectrum allocation and exclusivity-protected in delivering programming of national scope, are mandated to serve in the public interest, including free over-the-air transmission of programming...

Cable and satellite TV service providers extend the reach of the broadcast networks and their local affiliates, delivering their signals to subscribers with reliable clarity... This adds value to their exclusive programming by increasing the viewing audience for their advertising... While it may make sense to require service providers to carry broadcast outlets, particularly less-popular ones, it's a bad idea to give broadcasters the right to charge for retransmission of their signals, as is now the case... They are subsidized by taxpayers and receive ample advertising revenues... They should be required to make their signals available to service providers in the same manner as they do to off-air viewers; on a no-charge basis...

Forcing service providers to negotiate with broadcasters for pay inevitably leads to bad-faith dealing... A broadcaster picks out a more vulnerable provider and demands an extortive rate for continued carriage, hoping to secure capitulation so they can move on to the next victim with an example having already been made... This process thus contributes to the escalation in rates your agency has long been very concerned with...

Further exacerbating this situation is the apparent permissibility of owners of large numbers of broadcast stations to require providers to negotiate for all of their outlets at once... This has allowed Sinclair, owner of the second-largest number of network-affiliated broadcast stations, to dictate terms over a broad geographic range without consideration for local conditions... Mediacom is their current target, by virtue of a close matchup between service areas... If they can put the provider over a barrel by cutting off service to a bulk of their systems at once, rather than a few at a time, they hope to wrest a desperation-influenced agreement...

Of perhaps even greater concern is Sinclair's outreach to Mediacom subscribers offering them discounts for switching service providers... Such tactics alone bespeak their extortive intent... When you consider that the provider they're pressing viewers to switch to is DirecTV, which is part-owned by the parent company of FOX Broadcasting, and that the disputes largely involve FOX affiliates, you have antitrust concerns as well...

Please consider relieving television service providers of this unwarranted nuisance, and ratepayers of this feckless graft.

Bernard Barton,
 Millennium Systems Satellite TV
 Elmwood, IL

--

No virus found in this outgoing message.
 Checked by AVG Free Edition.
 Version: 7.5.432 / Virus Database: 268.16.5/616 - Release Date: 1/4/2007 1:34 PM

No. of Copies rec'd
 List ABCDE

0

2/8/2007

Sandra Lyn Bailey

FEB - 9 2007

06-189

From: John Goodman [John.Goodman@knology.com] Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2007 10:15 PM
To: Robert_Mcdowell@fcc.gov; Cristina Pauze; Jonathan Adelstein; Rudy Brioché; Bruce
Gottlieb; Chris Robbins; Rosemary Harold
Cc: John Goodman
Subject: Copy of CA2C Ex Parte and attachments
Attachments: CA2C FCC Exparte Cable Comp NOI 1-24-07.doc; CA2C Vertical Integration 2006 FCC.doc;
CA2C Vertical Integration Summary 1990 1994 2006 FCC.doc

We would like to thank you for giving us the time to discuss our summaries of MVPD Vertical Integration. A copy of the Ex Parte and the vertical integration summaries are attached for your reference.

We have been attempting to do the required electronic filing but the FCC System has not been responding after we are on the web site. We assume this is a temporary condition and will retry the system both this evening and first thing tomorrow morning.

Regards,

John Goodman

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

2/8/2007

Sandralyn Bailey

FILED/ACCEPTED

FEB 9 2007

06-189

From: Adam Peach [apeach@ucsg.com]**Sent:** Wednesday, December 20, 2006 6:45 PMFederal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**To:** KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratateweb; Robert McDowell**Subject:** Cable Regulation and Other Observations

Commissioner Martin,

I am glad to see that the FCC approved new rules governing the franchise systems for cable television service. I would also like to highlight the following points:

- By voting for a much needed change, Mr. McDowell has shown that he is not completely incompetent. I am pleased to learn that either a) Mr. McDowell doesn't have pass ties to anyone in the cable industry, or b) even better, he isn't too afraid to hurt someone else's feelings (or tick off the hand that feeds him through his worthless lobbying efforts).
- Commissioners Copps and Adelstein are complete idiots. Why would you require a franchise at all? All cable franchises requirements do are a) raise prices by restricting competition, b) give too much power to socialists like Copps and Adelstein. I would encourage the majority commissioners to highlight that Copps and Adelstein are clear supporters of policies that raise prices for consumers. They seem to argue for lower prices in BLS/T, but here it is just the opposite. Clearly, their actions and public statements are only done in an attempt to meet the needs of other scum-bag lobbyists that buy them dinner.
- Mr. McDowell has talked about the "ethical" issues associated with voting in the BLS/T merger review. I would like to say that it's unethical to let to Marxist-fools like Copps and Adelstein interfere with commerce. Mr. McDowell should still be ashamed of himself for not willing to vote against COMPTel (he can tell himself that it is due to ethical promises made at his confirmation hearing, but we all know that isn't the reason). Mr. Martin --- you should feel like a little girl for allowing yourself/your agenda to be pushed around by these ugly men. And again, they are ugly. High-speed broadband definitely isn't being used to look at pictures of them. If there is a need for regulation in the economy, it should be a regulation limiting how many people as ugly as Copps and Adelstein are able live in the country, as their presence imposes a cost to other members of society (the cost of having to look at someone so ugly).
- Lastly, as noted above, there really isn't a need for cable franchise rights/licenses anyways. The same could be said for all telecommunications. Let firms provide goods to consumers free of regulation. The time has come for all of you to go home (or be fired), and do something useful. Your current jobs are a waste of public time and money.

Enjoy the Holidays!

Adam Peach

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

2/8/2007